

THE DAILY JOURNAL

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1896.

Washington Office—1400 Pennsylvania Avenue

Telephone Calls.

Business Office—228 E. Indiana Street.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

DAILY BY MAIL.

Daily only, one month, \$2.00

Daily only, three months, \$5.00

Daily only, one year, \$15.00

Daily, including postage, one year, \$18.00

Sunday only, one year, \$2.00

When furnished by agents.

Daily, per week, by carrier, 15 cts

Daily and Sunday, per week, by carrier, 20 cts

Per year, \$1.00

Reduced Rates to Clubs.

Subscriptions with any of our numerous agents or send

orders to the

JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,

Indianapolis, Ind.

Persons sending the Journal through the mails in the

country should put on an eight-page paper a

postage stamp, on a twelve or sixteen-page

paper a two-cent postage stamp. Foreign postage is

added to these rates.

All communications intended for publication in

this paper must, in order to receive attention, be

accompanied by the name and address of the writer.

Can be found at the following places—

PAUL—American Exchange in Paris, 20 Boulevard de

Cannes.

NEW YORK—Gleason House, Windsor Hotel and Astor

Hotel.

CHICAGO—Palmer House, Auditorium Hotel and P.

O. News Co., 211 Adams street.

CINCINNATI—J. H. Hawley & Co., 154 Vine street.

LOUISVILLE—C. T. Deering, northwest corner of

Third and Jefferson sts., and Louisville Book Co., 226

Fourth ave.

WASHINGTON—The Union News Company, Union Depot.

It may be observed that a war cloud

has not been reported by cable for a

whole week.

The press of the United States

has been so nearly unanimous

and so severe that Congress could afford

to drop the matter.

Having placed itself on record as

refusing to do anything for the financial

relief of the government, the Senate will

address itself to the great work of electing

a Sergeant-at-Arms.

The people of Indiana would be justified

in holding a mass meeting and de-

nouncing their two recent United

States Senators for misrepresenting the

State on the silver question.

It rests with Governor Matthews either

to call a special session of the Legisla-

ture or not to do so. Further than that,

he has no official voice in any question

growing out of the decision of the Sup-

reme Court.

The public debt statement for Janu-

ary showed an increase over the

previous month of \$5,747,975, but that is

not a circumstance to the increase which

will be shown by the next statement,

which will include the new bond issue.

The Democratic Mayor of Boston, evi-

dently discouraged with his own party

leaders as advisers, has invited a num-

ber of Republican business men to act

as an advisory cabinet. Here is a hint

which Mayor Taggart could take with

profit.

Governor Matthews will remove one

cause of irritation when he arrives at

the conclusion that it is not treason for

a Supreme Court, a majority of whose

members are Democrats, to render de-

cisions at variance with his official acts

and official opinions.

Those who read the outlines of the

theater of the High School

a few evenings ago must have

been struck not only with the subjects

but with the treatment, which indicated

an unusual breadth and originality. The

Indianapolis High School teaches En-

glish expression and literature.

The New York Herald has "The Sec-

retary of Agriculture on the Outlook for

American Farmers" as the caption for

an editorial. It may truthfully be said

that American farmers are on the out-

look for the Secretary of Agriculture,

and if they get a chance at J. Sterling

Morton he will realize the quality of that

outlook.

Lord Salisbury's recent speech has

raised a storm of wrath in England,

even his warmest supporters and friends

admitting that its apologetic tone was

humiliating and indefensible. From

this distance it seems to have been bad

quittal. The result is a victory for

law and order in establishing the prin-

ciple that the commander of troops, acting

in conjunction with the civil authori-

ties, may fire on a mob if necessary to

suppress or repel it. The principle never

should have been brought in question.

THE DUTY OF THE GOVERNOR.

Governor Matthews last night an-

nounced that he would not call a special

session of the Legislature to pass a new

apportionment law. Men whose legal at-

tainments are not questioned hold that

the only way out of the difficulty into

which the State has been plunged by the

recent decision of the Supreme Court is

by the enactment of a new apportion-

ment, and it is to be hoped the Governor

may, after thorough and careful inquiry

be induced to reconsider his announce-

ment and call the Legislature together.

The Constitution says: "It is the

duty of the Governor, the public wel-

fare shall require it, he may at any time,

by proclamation, call a special session." The

Constitution assumes that the Gov-

ernor's opinion and action in regard to

calling an extra session will be based

solely upon considerations of the pub-

lic welfare. A fair construction of the

provision quoted would exclude consid-

eration by the Governor of all questions

of personal, political or party advantage

or disadvantage and hold him to those

of the public welfare alone. It would

also exclude consideration by him of the

question of the title of the hold-over Sen-

ators or any other collateral question

growing out of the present situation.

The only question for him to decide is

whether it is better for the public wel-

fare that a constitutional apportionment

act should be passed as soon as prac-

ticable or that the State should be with-

out one until a new Legislature shall be

elected and convene.

In deciding this question the Governor

ought to give due weight to the fact

that if he does not call a special session

the next Legislature will have to be

elected under the apportionment of 1885,

which will work serious injustice in many

counties. Aside from partisan consid-

erations, which really ought not to enter

into the case at all, the public welfare

requires that the entire population and

every county in the State should be fairly

represented in the Legislature. Equality

of representation is a fundamental prin-

ciple of republican government, and tax-

ation without representation is odious,

no matter what form it takes. Certainly

there could be no higher consideration

of public welfare than that all parts of

the State should have their constitutional

representation in the General Assembly.

If the Governor fails to call a special

session he will thereby compel an elec-

tion under an apportionment act based

on an enumeration of voters nearly 60,000

less than that of 1889, and will thus give

his official sanction to the practical dis-

franchisement of a large number of vot-

ers and to depriving several counties of

their proper representation in the next

Legislature. This is not a question of

politics but of public welfare.

The Governor should also recognize

that considerations of public welfare for-

bid the holding of an election under a

law that is not only obsolete but ab-

solutely unconstitutional. Common

sense and common honesty rebel against

such a proceeding, and it is never pro-

motive of the public welfare to force the

people into a course opposed to common

sense and common honesty. If there

were no way out of the present dilemma

but an election under the act of 1885, if

that were necessary to save the State

from anarchy or public disaster, it would

be defensible, but when there is another

and better way out it could not be de-

fended. If the Governor persists in

his refusal to call a special session

the people of Indiana can say to him:

"We are tired of gerrymanders;

we wanted a fair and constitutional

apportionment; you had it in your

power to give us one by a simple exer-

cise of your constitutional authority; in-

stead of that you have compelled us to

hold another election under a rotten ger-

rymander and to elect a Legislature

which is not representative of all the

people. You have not only shown your

own preference for an unconstitutional

the oath of office he is a Senator for

the full term for which he was elected. His

conclusion, based on fundamental prin-

ciples and broad constitutional grounds,

is that the invalidation of an apportion-

ment act in no way affects the hold-over

Senators elected under it in their title

to or tenure of office. The Journal has

no doubt that the best legal opinion of

the State in both parties will endorse

this view. In fact, the first division of

opinion on the subject has almost disap-

peared.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The chances seem to be rather unfavor-

able to an appropriation by Congress for

a public building in this city. The chief

obstacle in the way of the proposition is

that the treasury is bankrupt, and that

the party leaders are determined to keep

down appropriations. If Indianapolis

and one or two other cities which are

enters of a large public business were

the only applicants, they would probably

receive favorable consideration. But the

getting of appropriations for public build-

ings is not based upon the merits of the

case. Combinations are made by Rep-

resentatives which can enact a bill, and

as the result, more cities which do not

need and should not have public build-

ings get them than do those which are

really in need. There are scores of cities

which have federal buildings in which

there is no business to warrant their

construction. Ambitious cities desire

them to give them an importance which

they would not otherwise have, or, at

least, which their pushing citizens think

they would not have. Consequently,

there are federal buildings in cities in

which the revenues collected by the gov-

ernment from the postal service do not

pay salary of the janitor and ordinary

repairs, to say nothing of the interest

on the cost. One cannot travel far or

visit many "boom" cities without seeing

a federal building on a lot given up to

weeds, and in which not half the rooms

are occupied. It would seem that the

residents of such cities serve rather to

show their meagerness by contrast than

to add to their importance, much as would

a man's hat serve to dwarf the small

boy who had put it on.

Enough money has been wasted in con-

structing public buildings in cities which

do not need them to provide structures

in all the cities having regular federal

courts, the usual federal officers, a pen-

sion agency, and which are centers of

an extended mail service. Until cities

which are the seats of so much federal

business have adequate public buildings

it is folly to spend money to build them

in cities in which all the federal busi-

ness can be done in a building which

can be rented for a postoffice for half

the money that the interest on the cost

of the public building involves. The gov-

ernment of the United States should ex-

ercise some of the business sense which

railroads, telegraph and insurance com-

panies do, which is to construct build-

ings only where it is cheaper to construct

than to rent. Money should not be voted

haphazard for public buildings, but the

heads of the public service or a special

commission should indicate where the

interest of the public service demands

that a general appropriation for build-

ings should be expended. The same is

true of river and harbor improvements.

The voting of money to make water-

ways where there is no water and har-

bors where no ships will sail has caused

the waste of tens of millions. The sus-

picion of log-rolling in passing bills for

harbor and public building bills will

not come until a gross sum appropriated

shall be expended under competent

hands. The gross sums will be much less

than the aggregate of log-rolling propo-

sitions, and the needs of the greater

number of people and the public service

will be better met.

THE ASSUMPTION OF A HEAD PRO-

FESSOR.

Professor Laughlin, of the University

of Chicago, while he did good service

against John Harvey last summer, has

no real warrant to claim financial in-

fallibility, as he does in an article in the

Forum entitled "The Financial Pro-

gramme." The topic indicates that the

whole question has been settled. He de-

clares that the increase of revenues for

the professors of the older college school

like Professor Sumner. He refuses to

consider facts as he does when he dis-

cusses the silver question. He has seen

his free-trade theory tested by the pres-

ent tariff. If he has noted the statistics

of trade he has seen that its first fruits

in one industry have been to increase

the imports of wool and woolen goods

\$30,000,